arXiv:1406.3594v2 [math.NT] 23 Feb 2015

On continued fraction expansion of potential counterexamples to p-adic Littlewood conjecture

Dzmitry Badziahin *

February 24, 2015

Abstract

The p-adic Littlewood conjecture (PLC) states that $\liminf_{q\to\infty} q\cdot|q|_p\cdot||qx||=0$ for every prime p and every real x. Let $w_{CF}(x)$ be an infinite word composed of the continued fraction expansion of x and let T be the standard left shift map. Assuming that x is a counterexample to PLC we show that limit elements of the sequence $\{\mathrm{T}^n w_{CF}(x)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are quite natural objects to investigate in attempt to attack PLC for x. We then get several quite restrictive conditions on such limit elements w. As a consequence we prove that we must have $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(w,n)-n=\infty$ where $P(w,n)$ is a word complexity of w. We also show that w can not be among a certain collection of recursively constructed words.

1 Introduction

In 2004 de Mathan and Teulie [6] proposed the following problem which is now called a p-adic Littlewood conjecture (PLC).

Conjecture (PLC)**.** *Let p be a prime number. Then every real x satisfies*

$$\liminf_{q\to\infty} q\cdot|q|_p\cdot||qx||=0 \tag{1}$$

where $||\cdot||$ denotes the distance to the nearest integer.

It is widely believed to be easier than the famous Littlewood conjecture where the expression above is replaced by

$$\liminf_{q\to\infty} q\cdot||qx||\cdot||qy||=0.$$

Despite of the essential efforts from the mathematical communities both conjectures still remain open.

Assume that there is a counterexample x to PLC. Then it must satisfy

$$\inf_{q\in\mathbb{N}}\{q\cdot|q|_p\cdot||qx||\}\geqslant\epsilon \tag{2}$$

for some $\epsilon>0$. We denote the set of $x\in\mathbb{R}$ which satisfy the condition (2) by $\mathbf{Mad}_\epsilon$. So PLC is equivalent to saying that for all $\epsilon>0$ the set $\mathbf{Mad}_\epsilon$ is empty.

It is already known that $\mathbf{Mad}_\epsilon$ is very "small". The condition (2) straightforwardly implies that x is badly approximable hence it belongs to the set of zero Lebesgue measure.

*Research supported by EPSRC Grant EP/L005204/1

Moreover $\mathbf{Mad}_\epsilon$ is included in the subset $\mathbf{Bad}_\epsilon$ of the set $\mathbf{Bad}$ of badly approximable numbers which is defined as follows

$$\mathbf{Bad}_\epsilon := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \ : \ \inf_{q\in\mathbb{N}}\{q\,||qx||\} \geqslant \epsilon\}.$$

In [6] it was shown that quadratic irrational x, the classical examples of badly approximable numbers, satisfy PLC. Later Bugeaud, Drmota and de Mathan [2] generalized that result to numbers which continued fraction expansion contain arbitrarily long periodic blocks. In 2007 Einsiedler and Kleinbock [4] proved that $\mathbf{Mad}_\epsilon$ is of zero box dimension for every $\epsilon > 0$.

Numbers from $\mathbf{Bad}$ can easily be described in terms of their continued fraction expansion. We'll state this classical fact in terms of infinite words (the details can be found in [3], for example).

Fact 1. *Let $w_{CF}(x)$ be an infinite word composed of the partial quotients of the continued fraction expansion of $x = [0; a_1, a_2, \ldots] \in \mathbb{R}$. If $x \in \mathbf{Mad}_\epsilon$ then $w_{CF}(x) \in \mathbb{A}_N^{\mathbb{N}}$ where $N = \epsilon^{-1} + 1$ and $\mathbb{A}_N := \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$. In the other words the word $w_{CF}(x)$ belongs to the finite alphabet $\mathbb{A}_N$.*

So if one wants to attack the PLC then it is natural to consider numbers x with $w_{CF}(x) \in \mathbb{A}_N^{\mathbb{N}}$ and to try to impose as may conditions on $w_{CF}(x)$ for potential counterexamples to PLC as possible. The ideal situation of course would be if that conditions become self-contradictory which would immediately imply that $\mathbf{Mad} = \emptyset$.

Some restrictions on $w_{CF}(x)$ for potential counterexamples x to PLC were recently imposed in [1]. In order to state them we introduce a couple of new definitions. We call a word $w \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ recurrent if every finite block occurring in w occurs infinitely often. Then w is eventually recurrent if $\mathrm{T}^m w$ is recurrent for some positive integer m where T is a standard left shift map on $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$.

Theorem (BBEK1)**.** *If $w_{CF}(x)$ is eventually recurrent then x satisfies PLC.*

Almost all well known classical infinite words such as Sturmian words or the Thue-Morse word, are recurrent so Theorem BBEK1 states that none of them can be a continued fraction expansion of the counterexample to PLC. Another implication of this theorem stated in [1] is that for $x \in \mathbf{Mad}$ the word complexity $P(w_{CF(x)}, n)$ as a function of n does not grow too slow. By the complexity $P(w, n)$ of the word w we mean the number of distinct blocks of length n which occur in w.

Corollary (BBEK2)**.** *If $x \in \mathbf{Mad}$ then $P(w_{CF}(x), n) - n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.*

On the other hand the next result from [1] states that the complexity of $x \in \mathbf{Mad}$ can not grow too fast as well.

Theorem (BBEK3)**.** *If $x \in \mathbf{Mad}$ then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log P(w_{CF}(x), n)}{n} = 0.$$

In other words Theorem BBEK3 says that the complexity $w_{CF}(x)$ of a counterexample to PLC grows slower than any exponential function. Surely there is a huge gap between subexponential growth from Theorem BBEK3 and linear growth from Corollary BBEK2. So there are still plenty of words $w_{CF}(x)$ uncovered by both of these statements.

In this paper we put more restrictions on the continued fraction expansion of the counterexamples to PLC. The next section explains that it is quite reasonable to look at the

limit points of $\{\mathrm{T}^n w_{CF}(x)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in order to attack PLC. For brevity the set of limit points of $\{\mathrm{T}^n w_{CF}(x)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ will be called by $\mathcal{W}_{CF}(x)$. In particular we provide several "easy-to-state" conditions on $w \in \mathcal{W}_{CF}(x)$ which imply PLC for x. One of them (Theorem 2), for example, substantially improves Corollary BBEK2 by putting the complexity condition from this corollary on every limit word $w \in \mathcal{W}_{CF}(x)$. Section 3 introduces a couple of quite general and rather technical core results on words $w \in \mathcal{W}_{CF}(x)$ which are then proved in the next Section 4. The rest of the paper is devoted to the proofs of all their applications.

2 A version of PLC for limit words $w \in \mathcal{W}_{CF}(x)$. Sets LMad and $\mathbf{LMad}_\epsilon$

One may try to attack PLC by taking q to be a linear combination of the denominators q_n and q_{n+1} of two consecutive convergents to x. The result of this attempt is presented in the following

Proposition 1. *Let $q_n < q_{n+1}$ be the denominators of two consecutive convergents to $x \in \mathbf{Bad}_\epsilon$. Then for every $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $r = r_{a,b,n} = |aq_n + bq_{n+1}|$ we have*

$$r \cdot |r|_p \cdot ||rx|| \leqslant 4\max\{a^2, b^2\}(N+1) \cdot |r|_p \tag{3}$$

where $N = [\epsilon^{-1}] + 1$.

Proof. We just use two standard facts: $(N+1)q_n > q_{n+1}$ (by Fact 1) and $q_n||q_n x|| < 1$, $q_{n+1}||q_{n+1}x|| < 1$. Then

$$r \cdot |r|_p \cdot ||rx|| \leqslant (2\max\{|a|,|b|\})^2 \cdot q_{n+1} \cdot \frac{1}{q_n} \cdot |r|_p \leqslant 4\max\{a^2,b^2\}(N+1)|r|_p. \qquad \square$$

As the consequence of the proposition, if x is in $\mathbf{Mad}_\epsilon$ then for every pair $\mathbf{q}_n = (q_n, q_{n+1})$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ one must have

$$r_{a,b,n} = 0 \text{ or } |r_{a,b,n}|_p \geqslant \frac{\epsilon}{4(N+1)} \cdot \min\{a^{-2}, b^{-2}\}. \tag{4}$$

This fact imposes an additional condition on $x \in \mathbf{Mad}_\epsilon$ or more exactly on every pair of denominators of consecutive convergents to x. Every such a pair must satisfy (4). By combining this with Fact 1 we get

if $x \in \mathbf{Mad}_\epsilon$ then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathrm{T}^n w_{cf}(x) \in \mathbb{A}_N^{\mathbb{N}}$ and (q_n, q_{n+1}) satisfies (4).

For convenience we introduce the following notation

$$\text{for } a \in \mathbb{N},\ A_a := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & a \end{pmatrix}; \quad \text{for } w = a_1 \dots a_n,\ A_w = A_{a_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot A_{a_n}. \tag{5}$$

Classical results from the theory of continued fractions relate the pairs (q_n, q_{n+1}) for different values of n in the following way:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & a_{n+1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} q_{n-1} \\ q_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} q_n \\ q_{n+1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

This observation gives rise to the following extension of the left shift map T on $\mathbb{A}_N^{\mathbb{N}}$ to the pairs $(w, \mathbf{q}) \in \mathbb{A}_N^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$:

$$\mathrm{T}(w, \mathbf{q}) := (\mathrm{T}w, A_{a_1}\mathbf{q}).$$

Condition (4) is reflected in the following definition. A point $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2) \in \mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ is said to be p-adically badly approximable if there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\forall (a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{(0, 0)\}$ one has

$$|aq_1 + bq_2|_p \cdot \min\{|q_1^{-1}|_p, |q_2^{-1}|_p\} \geqslant \min\{|a|^{-2}, |b|^{-2}\} \cdot \epsilon.$$

Sometimes instead of projective coordinates we will use affine ones. In that case we say that $\omega \in \mathbb{Q}_p$ is p-adically badly approximable if $(\omega, 1)$ is. We call the set of all p-adically badly approximable points by **PBad**. Then by analogy with the definition of $\mathbf{Bad}_\epsilon$ we define the set $\mathbf{PBad}_\epsilon$ as the subset of **PBad** containing those points $\mathbf{w}$ for which ϵ in the definition is fixed.

The next crucial proposition links the counterexamples x to PLC with the limit points of the sequence $\{T^n(w_{CF}(x), \binom{0}{1})\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.

Proposition 2. *If x is a counterexample to PLC then every limit point $(w, \mathbf{x}_p)$ of $\{T^n(w_{CF}(x), \binom{0}{1})\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the following property: there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ one has $T^n(w, \mathbf{x}_p) \in \mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{N}}_N \times \mathbf{PBad}_\epsilon$ where $N = [\epsilon^{-1}] + 1$ as above.*

The proof of the proposition is postponed till the end of this section. We define the set of pairs $(w, \mathbf{x}_p)$ which satisfy the conditions of this proposition by **LMad** (letter L is for limit point). By $\mathbf{LMad}_\epsilon$ we denote the subset of **LMad** containing those pairs for which the parameter ϵ is fixed. In other words the proposition says that if at least one limit point of $\{T^n(w_{CF}(x), \binom{0}{1})\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is not in **LMad** then x is not in **Mad**. By Fact 1 and the compactness of the set $\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{N}}_N$ for every $x \in \mathbf{Bad}_\epsilon$ elements $\mathrm{T}^n(w_{CF}(x))$ belong to the compact set. It is also well known that $\mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ is compact. Therefore the sequence $\{T^n(w_{CF}(x), \binom{0}{1})\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ must have at least one limit point which can be tested for inclusion in **LMad**.

The upshot of this discussion is that to attack PLC it is natural to investigate the set **LMad**. The straightforward problem about it is

Problem A. *Is* **LMad** *empty?*

Surely the positive answer to this problem would immediately imply that **Mad** is empty as well. Unfortunately this is not the case as shown by the following result. Let $w = a_1 a_2 \dots$ be an infinite word. Then by w_l we denote its finite prefix of length l: $w_l := a_1 \dots a_l$.

Theorem 1. *Let $w \in \mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{N}}_N$ be a periodic infinite word and $l \in \mathbb{N}$ be the length of its minimal period. Then $(w, \mathbf{x}_p)$ is in* **LMad** *if and only if $\mathbf{x}_p$ coincides with one of the eigenvectors of $A^T_{w_l}$.*

Since infinitely (countably) many different matrices A^T_w have eigenvectors in $\mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$, this theorem shows that the set **LMad** is infinite. And therefore the answer to Problem A is "no". Luckily or not, Theorem 1 does not provide us with any counterexample to PLC. Indeed, Bugeaud, Drmota and de Mathan [2] showed that for $x \in \mathbf{Mad}$ a periodic word w can not be in $\mathcal{W}_{CF}(x)$.

We will prove Theorem 1 in Section 7.

Remark. In [4] the following generalization of PLC was posed: *every pair $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{Q}_p$ satisfies*

$$\inf_{a\in\mathbb{N}, b\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}} \max\{|a|, |b|\} \cdot |ax - b| \cdot |ay - b|_p = 0. \qquad (EK)$$

This conjecture has close connection with Problem A. In particular a similar method to that used in the proof of Theorem 1 shows that if $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $y \in \mathbb{Q}_p$ are irrational roots of the same quadratic polynomial then Condition (EK) fails which in turn means that the proposed

generalization of PLC is false. We leave the details of this fact to the interested reader as an exercise.

The next natural question about **LMad** is: are there more elements in it? Or more formally we state it as follows

Problem B. *Is it true that for every* $(w, \mathbf{x}_p) \in \mathbf{LMad}$ *the word* w *is periodic?*

The positive answer to this problem will again imply PLC. We will reformulate it in a slightly different way which, in authors opinion, is more natural. It follows straightforwardly from the definition that the set **LMad** is invariant under T and so is the set $\mathbf{LMad}_\epsilon$ for every $\epsilon > 0$. Moreover it can be verified that $\mathbf{LMad}_\epsilon$ is also closed and therefore it is compact. It is well known that every compact invariant set contains a minimal invariant subset i.e. a subset which does not contain any other non-empty invariant closed subsets. Therefore it is sufficient to consider the minimal compact invariant subsets of **LMad**.

Note that for each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{LMad}$ described in Theorem 1 we have $\mathrm{T}^l\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}$ which in turn implies that the set $\{\mathrm{T}^n\mathbf{x}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is finite. So all minimal invariant sets generated by these elements $\mathbf{x}$ are also finite. On the other hand every finite minimal invariant set must be generated by an element $(w, \mathbf{x}_p)$ with periodic w (by finiteness we must have $\mathrm{T}^l w = w$ for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$). Therefore Problem B can be reformulated as follows:

Problem B' *Are there infinite closed subsets of* **LMad** *which are minimal invariant under* T*?*

An advantage of investigating minimal invariant subsets is that we know quite well how should the first coordinate of every element $(w, \mathbf{x}_p)$ of a minimal invariant set look like ([5][Theorem 1.5.9]). In that case w is uniformly recurrent or in other words it is recurrent and for each finite factor u of w the distance between any two consecutive appearances of u in w is bounded above by some constant $d = d(u)$.

The author believes that Problem B (respectively B') has a positive answer. In this paper we will impose rather restrictive conditions on the elements of **LMad**. The most general but technical of them are presented in Theorems 5 and 6 which are introduced in Section 3. The author does not know if they rule out every possible infinite word w (this would actually imply PLC) however it seems that this is not the case, there are still plenty of uncovered infinite words and therefore there are many numbers x for which the PLC still remains open. Here we provide some "easy-to-state" applications of that results.

First of all, if $(w, \mathbf{x}_p) \in \mathbf{LMad}$ then the complexity of the word w can not grow too slow.

Theorem 2. *Let non-periodic* $w \in \mathbb{A}_N^{\mathbb{N}}$ *be such that* $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, $P(w, n) \leqslant n + C$ *for some positive absolute constant* C*. Then* $\mathbf{x} = (w, \mathbf{x}_p) \notin \mathbf{LMad}$ *for every* $\mathbf{x}_p \in \mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$.

The proof of this theorem is described in Section 8. Since the complexity function is strictly increasing then the straightforward corollary of Theorem 2 is

Corollary. *If* x *is a counterexample to PLC then for any* $w \in \mathcal{W}_{CF}(x)$*,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(w, n) - n \to \infty.$$

In particular, the set $\mathcal{W}_{CF}(x)$ *must not contain Sturmian words.*

Next, we can show that for a big collection of words w which can be recurrently constructed by concatenations the pair $(w, \mathbf{x}_p)$ is never in **LMad**. We call $\mathcal{W}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_n)$ a concatenation map if it is some composition of concatenations of words $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n$. Recall that by A_w we denote the matrices defined by (5). Also for any ring R with identity by $\mathrm{SL}_2^{\pm}(R)$ we denote the set of 2×2 matrices with determinant ± 1. Finally by $\mathbb{Z}_p$ we denote the set of p-adic integer numbers.

Theorem 3. *Let a sequence of finite words over the alphabet $\mathbb{A}_N$ be constructed recursively as follows: $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m$ are given words of length 1 such that not all of them equal to each other; for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\sigma_{n+m} := \sigma_{n+m-1}\mathcal{W}(\sigma_n, \sigma_{n+1}, \dots, \sigma_{n+m-1})$$

where $\mathcal{W}$ is a concatenation map. Assume that for every m-tuple of words $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_m$ the equation

$$A_{\eta_m} = \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}(X, A_{\eta_1}, \dots, A_{\eta_{m-1}})$$

has at most one solution $X \in \mathrm{SL}_2^{\pm}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. Here $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$ is made of $\mathcal{W}$ by replacing each concatenation with a product of matrices. Then for every limit word w of the sequence σ_n and every $\mathbf{x}_p \in \mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$, $(w, \mathbf{x}_p) \notin \mathbf{LMad}$.

In fact the condition on $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m$ in the theorem can be weakened. We just need that not all of these words are the powers of the same finite word. However for the sake of simplicity we do not put this condition to the theorem. Its proof is provided in Section 6.

Theorem 3 covers a big collection of automatic words. In particular one can check that the Fibonacci word w_{fib} satisfies all of theorem's conditions. Indeed it is the limit point of the sequence $\{\sigma_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ constructed as follows:

$$\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \text{ are distinct one-digit words;} \quad \sigma_{n+1} = \sigma_n\sigma_{n-1}.$$

Therefore $(w_{fib}, \mathbf{x}_p)$ is never in **LMad**.

Finally we give a nice combinatorial condition on a word w which guarantees that $(w, \mathbf{x}_p)$ does never belong to **LMad**. Before we do that we define a sequence of bipartite graphs $G_n(S_n, T_n, E_n)$ related to w. Their definition distantly resembles more classical Rauzy graphs for infinite words. We set both S_n and T_n to be sets of all different factors of w of length n. Then vertices $s \in S_n$ and $t \in T_n$ are linked with an edge iff the word st is itself a factor of w.

Theorem 4. *Let $w \in \mathbb{A}_N^{\mathbb{N}}$ be a non-periodic uniformly recurrent word. If a number of connected components in G_n is bounded by an absolute constant independent of n then $(w, \mathbf{x}_p) \notin \mathbf{LMad}$ for every $\mathbf{x}_p \in \mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$.*

Note that the number of edges in $G_n(S_n, T_n, E_n)$ coincides with $P(w, 2n)$. Heuristically more edges G_n has, less chance that it has many connected components is. So it would be natural to test the conditions of Theorem 4 for words w of high complexity.

The proof of this theorem is provided in Section 9.

Remark. None of the results in this section cover the Thue-Morse word w_{tm}. The author believes that the main Theorem 5 itself can be applied to it in order to show that $(w_{tm}, \mathbf{x}_p)$ is never in **LMad**. Anyway it would be interesting to check if there is any prime p and point $\mathbf{x}_p \in \mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ such that $(w_{tm}, \mathbf{x}_p) \in \mathbf{LMad}$.

We finish this section with the proof of Proposition 2. Assume that x is a counterexample to PLC, i.e. $x \in \mathbf{Mad}_\delta$ for some $\delta > 0$. Choose $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\delta = \epsilon/4(N+1)$. Note that $N_\delta = [\delta^{-1}] + 1$ is smaller than $N = N_\epsilon$ and therefore Fact 1 shows that $w_{CF}(x) \in \mathbb{A}_N^{\mathbb{N}}$ and consequently every limit point $w \in \mathcal{W}_{CF}(x)$ lies in the same space. Next, notice that $(0, 1)$ is a pair (q_{-1}, q_0) and therefore

$$\mathrm{T}^n\left(w_{CF}(x), \begin{pmatrix}0\\1\end{pmatrix}\right) = \left(\mathrm{T}^n w_{CF}(x), \begin{pmatrix}q_{n-1}\\q_n\end{pmatrix}\right).$$

Consider an arbitrary limit element $(w, \mathbf{x}_p)$ of $\{T^n(w_{CF}(x), \binom{0}{1})\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Assume that for some $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ the value $r_{a,b} = ax_p + bx'_p$ satisfies $r_{a,b} = 0$. It means that there is a subsequence q_{n_k}, q_{n_k+1} for which

$$r_{a,b,n_k} := |aq_{n_k} + bq_{n_k+1}|_p$$

tends to zero as $k \to \infty$. Surely r_{a,b,n_k} can not be zero for infinitely many of k since the denominators q_n tend to infinity with n. Therefore at some point the expression r_{a,b,n_k} starts violating (4) and we get a contradiction. To finish the proof we notice that Condition (4) remains true for every limit point of the sequence $(q_n, q_{n+1})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and therefore it must be true for $\mathbf{x}_p$ which immediately implies that $\mathbf{x}_p \in \mathbf{PBad}_{\delta/(4(N_\delta+1))} = \mathbf{PBad}_\epsilon$. This finishes the proof of the proposition.

3 Core results

Before introducing the main result we need to do some preparation. We equip the space $\mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ with the metrics defined as follows. Given $\mathbf{w} = (\omega_1, \omega_2), \mathbf{v} = (\upsilon_1, \upsilon_2) \in \mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ let

$$d(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) := |\omega_1\upsilon_2 - \omega_2\upsilon_1|_p \cdot \min\{|\omega_1|_p^{-1}, |\omega_2|_p^{-1}\} \cdot \min\{|\upsilon_1|_p^{-1}, |\upsilon_2|_p^{-1}\}.$$

Wherever possible we will take the coordinates (ω_1, ω_2) of $\mathbf{w}$ such that $\max\{|\omega_1|_p, |\omega_2|_p\} = 1$. If this happens we emphasize it by using slightly different notation: $\mathbf{w} \in \tilde{\mathbf{P}}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$. One can see that for $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v} \in \tilde{\mathbf{P}}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ the definition of distance $d(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v})$ as well as the definition of $\mathbf{w}$ being p-adically badly approximable point becomes simpler.

Consider the set $\mathrm{SL}_2^{\pm}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. In accordance to the Jordan normal form of the matrices in $\mathrm{SL}_2^{\pm}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ one can split it into two subsets:

- $\mathrm{SL}_{2,1}^{\pm}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ which consists of all matrices having two different eigenvectors in $\mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$.
- $\mathrm{SL}_{2,2}^{\pm}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ which consists of matrices which are similar to one of the matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} v & 0 \\ 1 & v \end{pmatrix}; \quad v \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}.$$

Lemma 1. *Let $A \in \mathrm{SL}_{2,1}^{\pm}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. Then there exists a positive integer $\kappa(A) \leqslant p^2$ such that for each eigenvalue λ of A one has $|\lambda^{\kappa(A)} - 1|_p \leqslant p^{-1}$.*

Proof. Both eigenvalues λ and λ' of A are the roots of the quadratic equation

$$\lambda^2 - \mathrm{tr}(A)\lambda + \det(A) = 0.$$

Since $\det(A) = \pm 1$, λ is a unit, so $|\lambda|_p = 1$. Further arguments follow the standard proof of Fermat Little theorem. We compose a complete list of representatives of residue classes in $\mathbb{Z}_p[\lambda]$ modulo p such that their p-adic norm equals one. Since all that residue classes are contained in the set $\{a + b\lambda \ : \ 0 \leqslant a, b < p\}$ there are at most p^2 elements on the list. We denote its size by $\kappa(A)$, then the list looks as follows: $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{\kappa(A)}$. If we multiply each element from the list by λ the resulting numbers will again represent each residue class $\mathbb{Z}_p[\lambda]$ modulo p with p-adic norm equals one. Then by looking at products we get

$$\prod_{i=1}^{\kappa(A)} x_i \equiv \prod_{i=1}^{\kappa(A)} \lambda x_i \pmod{p} \quad \Rightarrow \quad |\lambda^{\kappa(A)} - 1|_p \leqslant p^{-1}.$$

□

Next, we need the notion of the p-adic logarithm which is defined as the following series

$$\log x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n-1} \frac{(x-1)^n}{n}.$$

It is well-defined on disc $|x-1|_p < 1$. Therefore by Lemma 1 the value $\log \lambda^{\kappa(A)}$ is well defined for every eigenvalue of $A \in \mathrm{SL}^{\pm}_{2,1}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. Notice also that for $|x|_p \leqslant p^{-1}$ one has $|\log x|_p = |x-1|_p$. Moreover one can check that for $x, y \in \mathbb{Q}_p$ such that $|x-1|_p < 1$ and $|y-1|_p < 1$ the following formula is satisfied

$$|\log x - \log y|_p = \left|\log \frac{x}{y}\right|_p = \left|\frac{x}{y} - 1\right|_p = |x-y|_p. \tag{6}$$

Now we want to remove (for the reason which will become clear later) all matrices A from $\mathrm{SL}^{\pm}_{2,1}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ such that one of their eigenvalues λ satisfies $\log \lambda^{\kappa(A)} = 0$. So we introduce another set

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p) := \left\{ A \in \mathrm{SL}^{\pm}_{2,1}(\mathbb{Z}_p) : \text{ for two eigenvectors } \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \text{ of } A,\ \log \lambda_1^{\kappa(A)} \neq 0, \log \lambda_2^{\kappa(A)} \neq 0 \right\}.$$

Given $\mathbf{x} = (w, \mathbf{x}_p) \in \mathbb{A}_N^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by $\mathbf{x}_{p,n}$ the element of $\mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ defined by the equality $(T^n w, \mathbf{x}_{p,n})$. Define

$$B_k(\mathbf{x}) := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p} \ : \ \exists\, n \in \mathbb{N},\ \text{s.t. } d\left(\begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{x}_{p,n} \right) \leqslant p^{-k} \right\}.$$

Roughly speaking the set $B_k(\mathbf{x})$ is comprised by p^{-k}-neighborhoods of the elements $\mathbf{x}_{p,n}$. The following theorem lies at the heart of this paper.

Theorem 5. *Let $A \in \widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. Let $\mathbf{w}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 \\ \omega_2 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\mathbf{w}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_3 \\ \omega_4 \end{pmatrix}$ be two eigenvectors of A^T with $\omega_i \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}, i \in \{1,2,3,4\}$ and $\max\{|\omega_1|_p, |\omega_2|_p\} = \max\{|\omega_3|_p, |\omega_4|_p\} = 1$. Consider $\mathbf{x} = (w, \mathbf{x}_p) \in \mathbb{A}_N^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ and define*

$$\epsilon_1 := d(\mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{w}_1), \quad \epsilon_2 := d(\mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{w}_2), \quad \epsilon_3 := |\log(\lambda_1^{4\kappa(A)})|_p, \quad \delta := \min\{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, p^{-1}\}$$

where λ_1 is one of the eigenvalues of A. Assume that $\delta \neq 0$. Finally let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfy the inequality

$$p^k \geqslant \frac{\sqrt{d(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) \cdot m}}{\epsilon_3 \cdot \delta \cdot \sqrt{2\epsilon_1\epsilon_2 \cdot p \cdot \kappa(A)}}. \tag{7}$$

If

$$\{\mathbf{x}_p, A^T\mathbf{x}_p, \ldots, (A^T)^m \mathbf{x}_p\} \subset B_k(\mathbf{x}) \tag{8}$$

then $\mathbf{x} \notin \mathbf{LMad}_\epsilon$ for

$$\epsilon = \sqrt{\frac{2\epsilon_1\epsilon_2 \cdot p \cdot \kappa(A)}{\epsilon_3^2 \delta^2 \cdot d(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) \cdot m}}. \tag{9}$$

Note that the values $\kappa(A)$, $d(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2)$ and ϵ_3 are solely defined by the matrix A and since $A \in \widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ the last two of them are always strictly positive. The value δ measures how "close" is $\mathbf{x}_p$ to one of the eigenvectors of A^T. If the parameters A and m are fixed then as δ tends to zero, the estimate (9) on ϵ tends to infinity. In other words smaller the value of δ, weaker the estimate for ϵ.

Before we move to the next result we show that Theorem 5 covers all matrices of the form A_w where w is any finite word.

Lemma 2. *For every finite nonempty word $w \in \mathbb{N}^n$ one has $A_w \in \widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$.*

Proof. Firstly we show that A_w has two distinct eigenvalues, so it is in $Sl^{\pm}_{2,1}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. The eigenvalues of A are the roots of the equation $\lambda^2 - \mathrm{tr}(A)\lambda + \det(A) = 0$. Since $\det(A) = \pm 1$ there is only one possibility for $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$, namely there should be $\mathrm{tr}(A_w) = 2$ and $\det(A_w) = 1$ but one can easily check that there are no words w with this property.

For algebraic λ the condition $\log \lambda^{\kappa(A)} = 0$ is only possible when λ is a root of unity. The only quadratic roots of unity are either roots of the equation $x^6 = 1$ or $x^4 = 1$. Therefore they must be roots of one of the following quadratic equations:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} x^2 - 1 = 0; & x^2 + 1 = 0; & x^2 - 2x + 1 = 0; \\ x^2 + 2x + 1 = 0; & x^2 - x + 1 = 0; & x^2 + x + 1 = 0. \end{array}$$

There are only two words $w_1 = 1$ and $w_2 = 2$ for which $|\mathrm{tr}(A_w)| \leqslant 2$. However an easy check shows that the eigenvalues of both A_1 and A_2 are not roots of unity. □

Now consider different type of matrices $A \in \mathrm{SL}_2^{\pm}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ which will be needed later. Namely,

$$A = D_a := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ a & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is easily verified that $D_a \notin \widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ so Theorem 5 is not applicable to it. However very similar (and even simpler) result is true for such matrices too.

Theorem 6. *Let $A = D_a$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Z}_p \backslash \{0\}$. Consider $\mathbf{x} = (w, \mathbf{x}_p) \in \mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{N}}_N \times \mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ and define $\delta := d(\binom{a}{0}, \mathbf{x}_p) \cdot |a|_p$. Assume that $\delta \neq 0$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfy the inequality $p^k \geqslant m \cdot (p\delta)^{-1}$. If (8) is satisfied:*

$$\{\mathbf{x}_p, A^T\mathbf{x}_p, \ldots, (A^T)^m\mathbf{x}_p\} \subset B_k(\mathbf{x})$$

then $\mathbf{x} \notin \mathbf{LMad}_\epsilon$ for $\epsilon = p\delta^{-1}m^{-1}$.

On the other hand if $\delta = 0$ then $\mathbf{x} \notin \mathbf{LMad}$.

4 Proof of Theorems 5 and 6

The distance $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ in $\mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ satisfies the following property which will be widely used throughout the proof.

Lemma 3. *Let $\mathbb{Z}_p$ be the set of p-adic integers and $A, B \in \mathrm{SL}_2^{\pm}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ be two matrices such that $A \equiv B \pmod{p^k}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e. the p-adic norm of each entry of the matrix $A - B$ is at most p^{-k}. Then for every two points $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ one has*

$$d(A\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) \leqslant \max\{d(B\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}), p^{-k}\}.$$

Proof. Denote $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2) = A\mathbf{w}$ and $\mathbf{u}' = (u'_1, u'_2) = B\mathbf{w}$. For simplicity we will choose $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v} \in \tilde{\mathbf{P}}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$. One can check that since p-adic norms of all entries of A are at most 1 then $\max\{|u_1|_p, |u_2|_p\} \leqslant \max\{|\omega_1|_p, |\omega_2|_p\}$. On the other hand since A is invertible then the inverse inequality is also true. This implies that $\mathbf{u} \in \tilde{\mathbf{P}}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ and by the same arguments $\mathbf{u}' \in \tilde{\mathbf{P}}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$.

Now we calculate

$$d(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = |u_1\upsilon_2 - u_2\upsilon_1|_p = |u'_1\upsilon_2 - u'_2\upsilon_1 + d_1\upsilon_2 - d_2\upsilon_1|_p.$$

where $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, d_2) = (A - B)\mathbf{w}$. Next,

$$d(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leqslant \max\{d(\mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}), |d_1 v_2 - d_2 v_1|_p\}.$$

Since $A \equiv B \pmod{p^k}$ an upper bound for the second term of the maximum is p^{-k} which finishes the proof of the lemma. □

The next lemma shows that if some $\mathbf{q} \in B_k(\mathbf{x})$ is not in $\mathbf{PBad}_\delta$ then there exists some point $\mathbf{x}_{p,l}$ which is not in $\mathbf{PBad}_{\max\{\delta, p^{-k}\}}$.

Lemma 4. *Let $\mathbf{q} = (q, q') \in B_k(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{u} = (u, v) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. Then if*

$$|(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q})|_p \cdot \min\{|q^{-1}|_p, |(q')^{-1}|_p\} \leqslant \delta$$

for some positive δ then there exists $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$|(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_{p,l})|_p \cdot \min\{|x_{p,l}^{-1}|_p, |(x'_{p,l})^{-1}|_p\} \leqslant \max\{\delta, p^{-k}\} \quad \textit{where} \quad \mathbf{x}_{p,l} = (x_{p,l}, x'_{p,l}).$$

Remark. Here and afterwards by $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q})$ we denote the standard inner product of vectors $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{q}$.

Proof. Since $\mathbf{q} \in B_k(\mathbf{x})$ then there exists $\mathbf{x}_{p,l}$ such that $d(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{x}_{p,l}) \leqslant p^{-k}$. Without loss of generality assume that $|q'|_p \geqslant |q|_p$. Now we calculate

$$|(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_{p,l})|_p = |ux_{p,l} + vx'_{p,l}|_p = |(q')^{-1}(uq'x_{p,l} - uqx'_{p,l} + uqx'_{p,l} + vq'x'_{p,l})|_p$$

$$\leqslant \max\{\max\{|x_{p,l}|_p, |x'_{p,l}|_p\} \cdot |u|_p \cdot d(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{x}_{p,l}), |x'_{p,l}|_p \cdot |(q')^{-1}|_p \cdot |(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q})|_p\}$$

$$\leqslant \max\{|x_{p,l}|_p, |x'_{p,l}|_p\} \cdot \max\{p^{-k}, \delta\}.$$

By dividing both sides of the inequality by $\max\{|x_{p,l}|_p, |x'_{p,l}|_p\}$ we get the statement of the lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 5. The general idea of the proof is to construct a sequence of points $\mathbf{q}_n \in B_k(\mathbf{x})$, to show that one of them do not lie in $\mathbf{PBad}_\epsilon$ and finally to apply Lemma 4. Define $\mathbf{q}_0 = (q_0, q'_0) \in \tilde{\mathbf{P}}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ such that $\mathbf{q}_0 = \mathbf{x}_p$. Represent the vector $\mathbf{q}_0$ in the basis $\mathbf{w}_1$ and $\mathbf{w}_2$: $\mathbf{q}_0 = \alpha\mathbf{w}_1 + \beta\mathbf{w}_2$ where by Cramer's rule

$$\alpha = \frac{\det(\mathbf{q}_0, \mathbf{w}_2)}{\det(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2)}, \quad \beta = \frac{\det(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{q}_0)}{\det(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2)}.$$

Since $\mathbf{q}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{w}_2 \in \tilde{\mathbf{P}}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ one can check that

$$|\alpha|_p = \frac{d(\mathbf{q}_0, \mathbf{w}_2)}{d(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2)} = \frac{\epsilon_2}{d(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2)} \quad \text{and} \quad |\beta|_p = \frac{d(\mathbf{q}_0, \mathbf{w}_1)}{d(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2)} = \frac{\epsilon_1}{d(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2)}. \tag{10}$$

Define $\mathbf{q}_n = (q_n, q'_n)$ as follows: $\mathbf{q}_n = (A^T)^n \mathbf{q}_0$. Vectors $\mathbf{w}_1$ and $\mathbf{w}_2$ are eigenvectors of A^T therefore

$$\mathbf{q}_n = \lambda_1^n \cdot \alpha\mathbf{w}_1 + \lambda_2^n \cdot \beta\mathbf{w}_2.$$

All entries of $(A^T)^n$ have p-adic norm at most 1, and moreover $(A^T)^n$ is invertible. Therefore one can repeat the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 3 to show that $\max\{|q_n|_p, |q'_n|_p\} = \max\{|q_0|_p, |q'_0|_p\} = 1$ or $\mathbf{q}_n \in \tilde{\mathbf{P}}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$.

For an arbitrary integer vector $\mathbf{u} = (u, v)$ one has $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}_n) = A\lambda_1^n + B\lambda_2^n$ where $A = A(u, v) = \alpha \cdot (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}_1), B = B(u, v) = \beta \cdot (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}_2)$.

From the equation for eigenvalues λ_1 and λ_2 one has $\lambda_1 \cdot \lambda_2 = \pm 1$ and $|\lambda_1|_p = |\lambda_2|_p = 1$. Therefore $\lambda_1^2 = \lambda_2^{-2}$. This gives us the following

$$|\tilde{Q}_n|_p := |(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}_{2\kappa(A)\cdot n})|_p = |A|_p \cdot \left| \frac{B}{A} + \lambda^n \right|_p . \tag{11}$$

where $\lambda = \lambda_1^{4\kappa(A)}$. Note that by Lemma 1, $|\lambda - 1|_p \leqslant p^{-1}$ and therefore $|\log \lambda|_p = |\log(\lambda_1^{4\kappa(A)})|_p = \epsilon_3 \leqslant p^{-1}$.

In the rest of the proof we will construct integers u and v such that for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the value of $|\tilde{Q}_n|_p$ becomes so small that $\mathbf{q}_{2\kappa(A)\cdot n}$ is surely out of $\mathbf{PBad}_\epsilon$. Then, using the fact that $\mathbf{q}_{2\kappa(A)\cdot n}$ is in $B_k(\mathbf{x})$ one concludes that $\mathbf{x}$ is not in $\mathbf{LMad}_\epsilon$.

We want to construct u and v such that $p\epsilon_3|A|_p > |A + B|_p$. Then it will imply that $|1 + B/A|_p < 1$ and this will enable us to use the idea from [2]. By Dirichlet pigeonhole principle one can choose $(u, v) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \backslash \{0\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &|A + B|_p = |uq_0 + vq_0'|_p \leqslant p(\epsilon_3\delta)^2; \\ &|u|, |v| < (\epsilon_3\delta)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that since $v \in \mathbb{Z}$ then $|v|_p > \epsilon_3\delta$. Rewrite the value $|(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}_1)|_p$ in the following way

$$|(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}_1)|_p = |q_0|_p^{-1} \cdot |\omega_1(uq_o + vq_0') + (\omega_2 q_0 - \omega_1 q_0')v|_p.$$

Since $|\omega_1|_p \leqslant 1$, an upper bound for the first summand is

$$|\omega_1(uq_o + vq_0')|_p \leqslant p(\epsilon_3\delta)^2$$

and for the second summand it is

$$|(\omega_2 q_0 - \omega_1 q_0')v|_p = \epsilon_1 \cdot |v|_p > \epsilon_3\delta^2 \geqslant p(\epsilon_3\delta)^2.$$

Therefore

$$|(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}_1)|_p = \frac{\epsilon_1 \cdot |v|_p}{|q_0|_p}.$$

By the construction we have $|A + B|_p \leqslant p(\epsilon_3\delta)^2$ and we just showed that

$$|A|_p = |\alpha \cdot (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}_1)|_p \overset{(10)}{=} \frac{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2 \cdot |v|_p}{|q_0|_p \cdot d(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2)}.$$

Notice that $|q_0|_p \cdot d(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) = |\omega_4(q_0\omega_1 - q_0'\omega_2) - \omega_2(q_0\omega_3 - q_0'\omega_4)|_p \leqslant \max\{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2\}$. This finally gives the following lower estimate for $|A|_p$:

$$\epsilon_3|A|_p \geqslant \epsilon_3 \cdot \min\{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2\} \cdot |v|_p > (\epsilon_3\delta)^2 \geqslant p^{-1} \cdot |A + B|_p.$$

So the aim is proved. Now we shall give an upper bound for $|A|_p$. If $|q_0|_p < \epsilon$ where ϵ is given by (9) then we consider $\mathbf{u} = (1, 0)$ and $|(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}_0)|_p < \epsilon$ and by Lemma 4 with $\epsilon \geqslant p^{-k}$ we get

$$|(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_{p,l})|_p \cdot \min\{|\mathbf{x}_{p,l}^{-1}|_p, |(\mathbf{x}_{p,l}')^{-1}|_p\} \leqslant \epsilon$$

for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies that $\mathbf{x}_{p,l} \notin \mathbf{PBad}_\epsilon$ and $(w, \mathbf{x}_p)$ is not in $\mathbf{LMad}_\epsilon$ anyway. Hence we can assume that $|q_0|_p \geqslant \epsilon$ and then

$$|A|_p \leqslant \epsilon_1\epsilon_2 \cdot \epsilon^{-1} \cdot (d(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2))^{-1}. \tag{12}$$

Next, estimate the value $|\frac{B}{A}+\lambda^n|_p$. Since by Lemma 1, $|\lambda-1|_p \leqslant p^{-1}$ and $|\frac{B}{A}+1|_p < 1$ we can use the property (6) of p-adic logarithm:

$$\left|\frac{B}{A}+\lambda^n\right|_p = \left|\log\left(\frac{-B}{A}\right) - n\log\lambda\right|_p < \left|\frac{\log(-B/A)}{\log\lambda} - n\right|_p.$$

Now we show that $\log(-B/A)/\log\lambda$ lies in $\mathbb{Q}_p$. This fact is proved in [2] but for the sake of completeness we repeat it here. It is trivial if $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}_p$. Otherwise there exists a unique $\mathbb{Q}_p$-automorphism σ of $\mathbb{Q}_p(\lambda)$ different from the identity. We have $\sigma(\lambda) = 1/\lambda$ and therefore $\sigma\log(\lambda) = \log(\sigma(\lambda)) = -\log\lambda$. Next,

$$A\lambda^n + B\lambda^{-n} = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}_{4\kappa(A)\cdot n}) = \sigma((\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}_{4\kappa(A)\cdot n})) = \sigma(A)\lambda^{-n} + \sigma(B)\lambda^n.$$

Since it is true for every natural n then we have $\sigma(A) = B$ and $\sigma(B) = A$. Combining these equations for σ together we get

$$\sigma\left(\frac{\log(-B/A)}{\log\lambda}\right) = \frac{\log(-B/A)}{\log\lambda}.$$

Further,

$$\left|\log\left(-\frac{B}{A}\right)\right|_p = \left|\frac{B}{A}+1\right|_p < p\epsilon_3 = p\cdot|\log\lambda|_p.$$

therefore $|\log(-B/A)/\log\lambda|_p < p$. This together with the fact that $\log(-B/A)/\log\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}_p$ implies that this number is also in $\mathbb{Z}_p$. Whence there exists integer n within the range $0 \leqslant n < p^d$ such that

$$\left|\frac{\log(-B/A)}{\log\lambda} - n\right|_p \leqslant p^{-d}.$$

In other words there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ within the range $0 \leqslant n < N$ such that

$$\left|\frac{B}{A}+\lambda^n\right| \leqslant \frac{p}{N}.$$

One can choose $1 \leqslant n \leqslant \frac{m}{2\kappa(A)}$ such that

$$|\tilde{Q}_n|_p \leqslant |A|_p \cdot \frac{2p\cdot\kappa(A)}{m} \overset{(12)}{\leqslant} \frac{2\epsilon_1\epsilon_2\cdot p\cdot\kappa(A)}{\epsilon\cdot d(\mathbf{w}_1,\mathbf{w}_2)\cdot m}.$$

Then by substituting the formula (9) for ϵ and using that $|u|, |v| < (\epsilon_3\delta)^{-1}$ we get $\max\{u^2, v^2\}\cdot|\tilde{Q}_n|_p < \epsilon$. Since $2\kappa(A)\cdot n \leqslant m$, vector $\mathbf{q}_{2\kappa(A)\cdot n}$ lies in the set $B_k(\mathbf{x})$. Therefore Lemma 4 is applicable here which in turn means that there exists $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$|(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_{p,l})|_p \cdot \min\{|x_{p,l}|_p^{-1}, |x'_{p,l}|_p^{-1}\} \leqslant \max\{|\tilde{Q}_n|_p, p^{-k}\}.$$

By (7) we estimate the value p^{-k} to finally get the bound

$$|(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_{p,l})|_p \cdot \min\{|x_{p,l}|_p^{-1}, |x'_{p,l}|_p^{-1}\} < \epsilon\cdot\min\{u^{-2}, v^{-2}\}.$$

Hence $\mathbf{x}_{p,l} \notin \mathbf{PBad}_\epsilon$ and $\mathbf{x} \notin \mathbf{LMad}_\epsilon$.

Proof of Theorem 6. As before represent $\mathbf{x}_p$ as (q_0, q'_0) where $\max\{|q_0|_p, |q'_0|_p\} = 1$ and denote it by $\mathbf{q}_0$. In this case one can easily check that $\delta = |aq'_0|_p$. By $\mathbf{q}_n$ we denote the

point $(A^T)^n\mathbf{q}_0$ and as in the proof of the previous theorem we have $\max\{|q_n|_p, |q'_n|_p\} = 1$. Note that $(D_a^T)^n = D_{na}^T$ so one can easily get an explicit formula for $\mathbf{q}_n$:

$$\mathbf{q}_n = (q_0 + na \cdot q'_0, q'_0).$$

Firstly consider the situation when $\delta = 0$. In that case we should have $q'_0 = 0$ which straightforwardly implies that $\mathbf{x}_p \notin \mathbf{PBad}_\epsilon$ for an arbitrarily small ϵ. One just need to consider $\mathbf{u} = (1, 0)$ and then $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}_0) = 0$.

Now we can assume that $\delta > 0$. By Dirichlet pigeonhole principle one can choose $\mathbf{u} = (u, v) \in \mathbb{Z}^2/\{0\}$ such that

$$|(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}_0)|_p \leqslant p\delta^2;$$
$$|u|, |v| < \delta^{-1}.$$

Since $|u|_p > \delta$ and $|aq'_0|_p = \delta$ we get

$$|(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}_0)|_p \leqslant p\delta^2 < p \cdot |u|_p \cdot |aq'_0|_p = p \cdot |uaq'_0|_p.$$

This implies that $|(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}_0)|_p \leqslant |uaq'_0|_p$ and therefore

$$\frac{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}_0)}{uaq'_0} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$$

One can write $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}_n)$ as

$$(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}_n) = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}_0) + nuaq'_0,$$

hence for each $d \in \mathbb{N}$ there always exists an integer n within the range $0 \leqslant n < p^d$ such that

$$|(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}_n)|_p = |uaq'_0|_p \cdot \left| \frac{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}_0)}{uaq'_0} - n \right|_p \leqslant \delta p^{-d}.$$

We choose the biggest possible d such that $p^d \leqslant m$ where m is defined in the statement of the theorem. Then we choose $0 \leqslant n < p^d$ such that $|(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}_n)|_p \leqslant \delta p^{-d} \leqslant p\delta m^{-1}$ and

$$\max\{u^2, v^2\}|(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}_n)|_p < p\delta^{-1}m^{-1} = \epsilon.$$

then since $n \leqslant m$ we have $\mathbf{q}_n \in B_k(\mathbf{x})$ and therefore by Lemma 4 there exists $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\max\{u^2, v^2\} \cdot |(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_{p,l})|_p \cdot \min\{|x_{p,l}|_p^{-1}, |x'_{p,l}|_p^{-1}\} < \max\{u^2, v^2\} \cdot \max\{|(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}_n)|_p, p^{-k}\} \leqslant \epsilon.$$

Hence $\mathbf{x}_{p,l} \notin \mathbf{PBad}_\epsilon$ and $\mathbf{x} \notin \mathbf{LMad}_\epsilon$.

5 General restrictions on words imposed by Theorem 5

In this section we consider several corollaries from Theorem 5 which will be more suitable for applications to various particular words $w \in \mathbb{A}_N^{\mathbb{N}}$. They will also provide some evidence that the conditions in this theorem together with Theorem 6 are in fact quite restrictive.

Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and an infinite or finite word w over alphabet $\mathbb{A}_N$ we define the set

$$U_k(w) := \{\phi_k(A_{w_n})) \in \mathrm{SL}_2^{\pm}(\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z}) \ : \ n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}\}$$

where $\phi_k \ : \mathrm{SL}_2^{\pm}(\mathbb{Z}) \mapsto \mathrm{SL}_2^{\pm}(\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z})$ is the canonical homomorphism. In other words it is the set of matrixes correspondent to all the prefixes w_n modulo p^k. Roughly speaking Theorem 5 says that if $U_k(w)$ contains a chain $A, A^2, \ldots, A^m$ with $A \in \widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ then either $\mathbf{x}_p$ coincides with one of the eigenvectors of A or $(w, \mathbf{x}_p)$ is not in $\mathbf{LMad}_\epsilon$ for some ϵ which can be explicitly calculated. Formally we have the following

Corollary 1. *Let* $\mathbf{x} = (w, \mathbf{x}_p) \in \mathbb{A}_N^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$. *Let* ϕ_k^* *be a canonical homomorphism* $\phi_k^* : \mathrm{SL}_2^{\pm}(\mathbb{Z}_p) \to \mathrm{SL}_2^{\pm}(\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z})$. *Suppose that there exists a matrix* $A \in \widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ *such that*

$$\phi_k^*(A), \phi_k^*(A^2), \dots \phi_k^*(A^m) \in U_k(w) \tag{13}$$

where the parameters $m, k \in \mathbb{N}$ *satisfy the condition* (7). *Assume also that the parameter* δ *defined in Theorem 5 for the matrix* A^T *is not zero. Then* $\mathbf{x} \notin \mathbf{LMad}_\epsilon$ *for* ϵ *given by* (9).

To check it we basically use Lemma 3 which shows that (8) follows from (13). Then all the conditions of Theorem 5 are satisfied.

In particular we can guarantee the condition (13) if $\phi_k^*(A) \cdot U_k(w) = U_k(w)$. Since $\mathrm{Id} \in U_k(w)$ then in this case every integer power $\phi_k^*(A^m)$ will belong to $U_k(w)$. In other words the condition (8) will be always satisfied and the value m from Corollary 1 will be only restricted by (7). As soon as $\mathbf{x}_p$ does not coincide with an eigenvector of A one can make m arbitrarily large and ϵ arbitrarily small as k tends to infinity. We will show in a minute that the situation when $\phi_k^*(A) \cdot U_k(w) = U_k(w)$ happens quite often.

One can easily check that $U_k(w)$ is always finite because the space it lies in is finite. It is also easy to check that $\#U_k(w) \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$. The next proposition gives information about the structure of sets $U_k(w)$.

Proposition 3. *Let* w *be a recurrent word. Then for each* $m \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $k \in \mathbb{N}$ *one has*

$$\phi_k(A_{w_m}) \cdot U_k(\mathrm{T}^m w) = U_k(w). \tag{14}$$

Proof. We first prove the following auxiliary statement: there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\phi_k(A_{w_m}) = \mathrm{Id}$. To show it we construct the sequence u_n of prefixes of w by the following rule.

- $u_1 := w_1$.
- Given u_n we take the prefix u_{n+1} such that it ends with u_n. In other words $u_{n+1} = v_{n+1}u_n$ for some word v_{n+1}. We can always do that because w is recurrent.

Because the set $\mathrm{SL}_2^{\pm}(\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z})$ is finite we can find $s, t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\phi_k(A_{u_s}) = \phi_k(A_{u_{s+t}})$. Then notice that

$$u_{s+t} = v_{s+t}v_{s+t-1}\dots v_{s+1}u_s.$$

By substituting this to the matrix equality we get that $\phi_k(A_{v_{s+t}\dots v_{s+1}}) = \mathrm{Id}$. Finally the observation that $v_{s+t}\dots v_{s+1} = w_m$ is the prefix of w finishes the proof of the auxiliary statement.

Now we can prove the proposition. We will prove (14) for $m = 1$. The rest can easily be done by induction. The inclusion $\phi_k(A_{w_1}) \cdot U_k(\mathrm{T}w) \subseteq U_k(w)$ is straightforward. Indeed for every prefix u of $\mathrm{T}w$ the word w_1u is the prefix of w and therefore $\phi_k(A_{w_1}A_u) = \phi_k(A_{w_1u}) \in U_k(w)$. For inverse inclusion we only need to check that Id belongs to $\phi_k(A_{w_1}) \cdot U_k(\mathrm{T}w)$. Other elements of $U_k(w)$ correspond to prefixes w_n which start with the letter w_1 and this fact straightforwardly implies that they also belong to $\phi_k(A_{w_1}) \cdot U_k(\mathrm{T}w)$. On the other hand by the auxiliary statement one can represent Id as $\phi_k(A_{w_m})$ where the word w_m starts with w_1 as well. The proof is finished. □

Since there are only $\#U_k(w)$ different elements $\phi_k(A_{w_m})$ then Proposition 3 shows that the collection $\mathbf{U}_k := \{U_k(\mathrm{T}^m w) \ : \ m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}\}$ consists of at most $\#U_k(w)$ elements. On the

other hand if $\#\mathbf{U}_k < \#U_k(w)$ then one can find two prefixes w_m, w_n with $\phi_k(A_{w_m}) \neq \phi_k(A_{w_n})$ such that

$$\phi_k(A_{w_m}^{-1}) \cdot U_k(w) = \phi_k(A_{w_n}^{-1}) \cdot U_k(w).$$

Without loss of generality assume that $m > n$. Then this leads us to $\phi_k(A_u) \cdot U_k(\mathrm{T}^n w) = U_k(\mathrm{T}^n w)$ where $w_n u = w_m$. By Lemma 2, $A_u \in \widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ and we also have $\phi_k(A_u) \neq \mathrm{Id}$ so the condition (13) is satisfied for $A = A_u$. Then the application of Corollary 1 will give us that either $\mathbf{x}_p$ is an eigenvalue of A_u or $\mathrm{T}^n\mathbf{x} \notin \mathbf{LMad}_\epsilon$ for ϵ defined by (9). However with help of only this basic observation we do not have a big control on ϵ. To use Corollary 1 in full we need some quantitative result of this kind which will be true for an arbitrarily large k.

Another useful corollary of Proposition 3 is that for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ the sets $U_k(\mathrm{T}^m w)$ have the same size.

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every infinite word $w \in \mathbb{A}_N^{\mathbb{N}}$ we define the sets

$$V(n, w) := \{A_{w_m} \ : \ w_n \text{ is the prefix of } \mathrm{T}^m w\}$$

and $V_k(n, w) := \phi_k(V(n, w))$. One can easily check that the sets $V(n, w)$ are nested as n grows: $V(n_1, w) \subset V(n_2, w)$ for $n_1 \geqslant n_2$. The same is surely true for their projections $V_k(n, w)$. If w is recurrent then $V(n, w)$ is always infinite for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, however $V_k(n, w)$ is obviously finite. We also define the set $Vp(n, w)$ which coincides with $V(n, w)$ but every element in $Vp(n, w)$ is considered as a matrix over $\mathbb{Z}_p$. Finally let

$$Vp(w) := \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{Vp(n, w)}.$$

We can not say anything about whether it is finite or not. However it is always non-empty since obviously $\mathrm{Id} \in Vp(w)$.

Proposition 4. *Let $w \in \mathbb{A}_N^{\mathbb{N}}$ be recurrent word. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $A \in V_k(n, w)$ we have $A \cdot U_k(w) = U_k(w)$.*

Proof. For each matrix $B \in U_k(w)$ associate the value $n(B)$, the length of the shortest word $w_{n(B)}$ such that $B = \phi_k(A_{w_{n(B)}})$. Since there are finitely many elements in $U_k(w)$ we can define $n := \max_{B \in U_k(w)}\{n(B)\}$. By the construction of n for every infinite word w^* which starts with w_n one has $U_k(w^*) \supset U_k(w)$.

Now for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $A_{w_m} \in V(n, w)$ by definition we have that the word $\mathrm{T}^m w$ starts with w_n. Therefore an application of Proposition 3 gives us $U_k(w) \subset U_k(\mathrm{T}^m w) = \phi_k(A_{w_m}) \cdot U_k(w)$. Or in other words, $\forall A \in V_k(n, w)$ one has $A \cdot U_k(w) \supset U_k(w)$. Finally since two sets $U_k(w)$ and $U_k(\mathrm{T}^m w)$ have the same cardinality we have the equality $A \cdot U_k(w) = U_k(w)$. □

6 Relation between $Vp(w)$ and LMad. Proof of Theorem 3

Proposition 4 shows that the condition (13) is satisfied for each $A \in V_k(n, w)$ where n is large enough. This observation gives rise to the following

Theorem 7. *Let $A_1, A_2 \in \widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ be such that their eigenvectors $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \mathbf{w}_3, \mathbf{w}_4 \in \mathbf{P}^1_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p}$ are all distinct. Let $w \in \mathbb{A}_N^{\mathbb{N}}$. Assume that for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\phi_k(A_1), \phi_k(A_2) \in V_k(n, w)$. Then for each $\mathbf{x}_p \in \mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$, $(w, \mathbf{x}_p) \notin \mathbf{LMad}_\epsilon$ where $\epsilon \gg_{A_1, A_2, p} p^{-k}$.*

Here we used the Vinogradov symbol: $x \gg_{A_1, A_2, p} y$ means that $x \geqslant c \cdot y$ where c is a positive constant dependent on A_1, A_2 and p only.

Proof. Consider the point $\mathbf{x} = (w, \mathbf{x}_p)$. Since all the values $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_4$ are distinct then

$$\max\{\min\{d(\mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{w}_1), d(\mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{w}_2)\}, \min\{d(\mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{w}_3), d(\mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{w}_4)\}\} \gg_{A_1,A_2,p} 1.$$

Without loss of generality assume that the maximum above is reached for $\mathbf{w}_1$ and $\mathbf{w}_2$. Choose the matrix $A = A_1$. Then the estimate on the parameter δ from Theorem 5 is $\delta \gg_{A_1,A_2,p} 1$.

We have that $\phi_k(A)$ is in $V_k(n, w)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore by Proposition 4 we have $\phi_k(A) \cdot U_k(w) = U_k(w)$ and therefore (13) is true for an arbitrary $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Choose the biggest possible m such that the condition (7) is satisfied, then $m \asymp p^{2k}$. Now Corollary 1 implies that

$$\mathbf{x} \notin \mathbf{LMad}_\epsilon \text{ for } \epsilon \overset{(9)}{\gg}_{A_1,A_2,p} m^{-1/2} \gg_{A_1,A_2,p} p^{-k}.$$

□

Note that in Theorem 7 the estimate for ϵ depends only on A_1, A_2 and p but it does not depend on k. This simple observation makes the following corollary true.

Corollary 2. *If in terms of Theorem 7 one additionally has that $A_1, A_2 \in Vp(w)$ then $\mathbf{x} \notin \mathbf{LMad}$.*

Corollary shows that for $(w, \mathbf{x}_p) \in \mathbf{LMad}$ the set $Vp(w)$ must be very small in a sense that it should not contain two "independent" matrices, i.e. the matrices from $\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ which eigenvectors do not intersect. This observation is sufficient to prove Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3. Firstly note that for $n > m$ the word σ_{n-1} is the prefix of σ_n and therefore it is the prefix of σ_l for any $l \geqslant n$. This in turn implies that σ_{n-1} is a prefix of w. Let $L(n)$ be the length of σ_n. Then for $n > 2m$, σ_{n-m} is the prefix of $\mathrm{T}^{L(n-1)}\sigma_n$. These two facts together imply that $A_{\sigma_{n-1}} \in V(L(n-m), w)$.

Now fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider the sequence $s_n := \{\phi_k(A_{\sigma_n})\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Since s_{n+m} depends only on m-tuple $s_n, \dots, s_{n+m-1}$ and there are only finitely many of such m-tuples over $\mathrm{SL}_2^{\pm}(\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z})$ then the sequence s_n is eventually periodic. Moreover by the condition of the theorem s_n is also uniquely determined by $s_{n+1}, \dots, s_{n+m}$ therefore s_n is purely periodic.

$L(n)$ tends to infinity as $n \to \infty$ therefore $s_1, \dots, s_m$ are in $V_k(l, w)$ for an arbitrary large l. Then since the inclusion is true for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that $s_1, \dots, s_m \in Vp(l, w)$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and finally $A_{\sigma_1}, \dots, A_{\sigma_k} \in Vp(w)$. Choose two of these matrices which are different (by the condition of the theorem we can do so). Without loss of generality let them be A_{σ_1} and A_{σ_2}. Since σ_1 and σ_2 are one letter words we use Lemma 2 to show that A_{σ_1} and A_{σ_2} are both in $\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ and that their eigenvectors $\mathbf{w}_i$, $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ are all distinct. Therefore Corollary 2 can be applied to $\mathbf{x} = (w, \mathbf{x}_p)$ which finishes the proof of the theorem.

We finish this section by showing that even weaker condition than in Corollary 2 on $Vp(w)$ tells quite a lot about possible elements $(w, \mathbf{x}_p) \in \mathbf{LMad}$.

Theorem 8. *Assume that $A \in \widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ is an element of $Vp(w)$ and $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2$ are two eigenvectors of A. Then there are at most two different values $\mathbf{x}_p$ such that $\mathbf{x} = (w, \mathbf{x}_p) \in \mathbf{LMad}$: $\mathbf{x}_p = \mathbf{w}_1$ or $\mathbf{x}_p = \mathbf{w}_2$.*

Note that both $\mathbf{w}_1$ and $\mathbf{w}_2$ are quadratic algebraic numbers therefore if w satisfies the conditions of Theorem 8 and $(w, \mathbf{x}_p) \in \mathbf{LMad}$ then $\mathbf{x}_p$ must be quadratic irrational.

Proof. there are two possible values $\mathbf{x}_p$ for which δ defined in Theorem 5 is zero: $\mathbf{x}_p = \mathbf{w}_1$ and $\mathbf{x}_p = \mathbf{w}_2$ where $\mathbf{w}_1$ and $\mathbf{w}_2$ are eigenvectors of A. If $\mathbf{x}_p$ is not one of that two values then δ becomes strictly positive and we can repeat the proof of Theorem 7 with A in place of A_1 to show that $(w, \mathbf{x}_p) \notin \mathbf{LMad}$. □

In view of Corollary 2 and Theorem 8 it would be interesting to investigate sets $Vp(w)$ for various words $w \in \mathbb{A}_n^{\mathbb{N}}$. In particular it would be good to describe the collection of words for which $Vp(w)$ does not contain any matrices $A \in \widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$.

7 Periodic words w

Now we prove Theorem 1. Consider an arbitrary purely periodic word w. Let u be the finite factor of w which comprises the minimal period of w. Then one can check that $Vp(w) = \{A_u^k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$. By periodicity $\mathrm{T}^l w = w$ where l is the length of u.

We start with more difficult "if" part of the theorem. In that case we are given that $\mathbf{x}_p$ coincides with an eigenvector of A_u^T. In other words it is the root of equation

$$\mathrm{T}^l(w, \mathbf{x}_p) = (w, \mathbf{x}_p) \tag{15}$$

If we represent $\mathbf{x}_p$ in affine form $\mathbf{x}_p = \binom{x_p}{1}$ then it becomes a quadratic equation $a + cx_p = (b + dx_p)x_p$ where $A_u = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{smallmatrix}\right)$.

Lemma 5. *Let $v \in \mathbb{Q}_p \backslash \mathbb{Q}$ be the solution of quadratic equation with integer coefficients. Then $\binom{v}{1} \in \mathbf{PBad}_\epsilon$ for some $\epsilon = \epsilon(v) > 0$.*

The proof of the lemma uses similar ideas as Liouville's proof that every real quadratic irrational is badly approximable.

Proof. Let $\bar{v}$ be a conjugate of v. Consider $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $|av - b|_p < 1$, for other pairs a, b the conditions of $\mathbf{PBad}_\epsilon$ are held automatically. Since $|a(v - \bar{v})|_p \ll_v 1$ we have that $|a\bar{v} - b|_p \ll_v 1$.

Consider the value $(av - b)(a\bar{v} - b)$. It is integer, therefore

$$|(av - b)(a\bar{v} - b)|_p \geqslant (a^2 v\bar{v} - ab(v + \bar{v}) + b^2)^{-1} \gg_v (\max\{a^2, b^2\})^{-1}.$$

Hence we get

$$|av - b|_p \cdot \min\{1, |v^{-1}|_p\} = \frac{|(av - b)(a\bar{v} - b)|_p \cdot \min\{1, |v^{-1}|_p\}}{|a\bar{v} - b|_p} \gg_v (\max\{a^2, b^2\})^{-1}.$$

□

Lemma 6. *Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{PBad}$. Then for any matrix $A \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ the point $A\mathbf{x}$ is in $\mathbf{PBad}$.*

Proof. Choose $\mathbf{x} \in \tilde{\mathbf{P}}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$, i.e. $\mathbf{x} = (x, y)$ with $\max\{|x|_p, |y|_p\} = 1$. Then since $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{PBad}$ we have $|ux + vy|_p \gg \min\{|u|^{-2}, |v|^{-2}\}$.

Write A in coordinate form: $A = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Consider $|u(ax + by) + v(cx + dy)|_p$. Then

$$|u \cdot (ax + by) + v \cdot (cx + dy)|_p = |(ua + vc)x + (ub + vd)y|_p$$

$$\gg \min\{|ua + vc|^{-2}, |ub + vd|^{-2}\} \gg \min\{|u|^{-2}, |v|^{-2}\}.$$

□

Now we are ready to show that for any solution of (15) we have $(w, \mathbf{x}_p) \in \mathbf{LMad}$. From the theory of continued fractions we know that $x_p \notin \mathbb{Q}$ (the solution of the equation $a + cx_p = (b + dx_p)x_p$ over $\mathbb{R}$ gives a solution which continued fraction expansion is periodic with period u, so it is infinite). Therefore by Lemma 5, $\mathbf{x}_p$ is in $\mathbf{PBad}_{\epsilon_0}$ for some positive ϵ_0.

Then by the construction of w and $\mathbf{x}_p$ we have that $\mathrm{T}^l(w,\mathbf{x}_p)=(w,\mathbf{x}_p)$ therefore to ensure that $(w,\mathbf{x}_p)\in\mathbf{LMad}$ it is sufficient to check that $\mathbf{x}_{p,i}\in\mathbf{PBad}_{\epsilon_i}$ where $1\leqslant i<l$, $\mathrm{T}^i(w,\mathbf{x}_p)=(\mathrm{T}^i w,\mathbf{x}_{p,i})$ and ϵ_i are some positive constants. However this is in fact true by Lemma 6 and the fact that by the construction of T, $\mathbf{x}_{p,i}=(A_{w_i})^T\mathbf{x}_p$. So, $(w,\mathbf{x}_p)\in\mathbf{LMad}_\epsilon$ where $\epsilon=\min_{0\leqslant i<l}\{\epsilon_i\}$. Now note that if $\mathrm{T}^l(w,\mathbf{x}_p)=(w,\mathbf{x}_p)$ then $\mathbf{x}_p$ coincides with one of the eigenvectors of $A_{w_l}^T$. This finishes "if" part of the proof of Theorem 1.

On the other hand the "only if" part this theorem is a straightforward corollary of Theorem 5. We just take $A=A_{w_l}$ which by Lemma 2 is in $\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. If $\mathbf{x}_p$ does not coincide with any of eigenvectors of A^T then the parameter δ in Theorem 5 is non-zero. Finally take k arbitrarily large and take the biggest $m\in\mathbb{N}$ which satisfies (7).

8 Collections $\mathbf{U}_k$ and low complexity words w

In this section we show how can Theorems 5 and 6 can be applied to words with low complexity. We start with the following auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 7. *Let u,v be two finite words over the alphabet $\mathbb{N}$. If $A_u,A_v\in\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ share the same eigenvector $\mathbf{v}$ then there exists a finite word w and positive integer values m_1,m_2 such that $u=w^{m_1},v=w^{m_2}$. Moreover A_w shares the same eigenvector $\mathbf{v}$.*

Proof. We consider $\mathbf{v}$ in affine form, so we can look at it as a number from $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p$. Note that $\mathbf{v}$ is algebraic and, since there is a field isomorphism between algebraic numbers in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p$ and in $\mathbb{C}$, two matrices A_u and A_v should also share the same eigenvector $\mathbf{v}^*\in\mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{C}}$.

From the theory of continued fractions we know that A_u always has two different real eigenvectors. Considered as real numbers they satisfy the conditions $\mathbf{v}_1^*<0<\mathbf{v}_2^*$ and $w_{CF}(\mathbf{v}_2^*)=u^\infty\,(=uuuuuu....)$. Since A_u and A_v share the same eigenvector in $\mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ they must also share the same positive eigenvector in $\mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{C}}$ which in turn implies that two infinite words u^∞ and v^∞ coincide. The conclusion of the lemma can be easily derived from this fact. □

Now we are ready to prove

Proposition 5. *Let $w\in\mathbb{A}_N^{\mathbb{N}}$ be recurrent and $\mathbf{U}_k$ be constructed from w. If for every $k\in\mathbb{N}$, $\#\mathbf{U}_k$ is bounded above by some absolute constant then there are at most two points $\mathbf{x}_p\in\mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ such that $\mathbf{x}=(w,\mathbf{x}_p)\in\mathbf{LMad}$. Moreover if w is not periodic then $(w,\mathbf{x}_p)\notin\mathbf{LMad}$ for all points $\mathbf{x}_p\in\mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$.*

Proof. Assume that the sequence $\#\mathbf{U}_k$ is bounded. Since $\#\mathbf{U}_k$ is non decreasing then there exists k_0 such that for $k\geqslant k_0$, $\#\mathbf{U}_k$ is a constant. Consider the minimal number $n\in\mathbb{N}$ such that $\phi_{k_0}(A_{w_n})=\mathrm{Id}$, from the proof of Proposition 3 we know that such n always exists. Then by Proposition 3, $\forall k\in\mathbb{N}$, $U_k(w)=\phi_k(A_{w_n})\cdot U_k(\mathrm{T}^n w)$ and in particular $U_{k_0}(w)=U_{k_0}(\mathrm{T}^n w)$. Remind that

$$\mathbf{U}_k:=\{U_k(\mathrm{T}^n w)\ :\ n\in\mathbb{N}\}.$$

Since for every $k\geqslant k_0$ the number of elements in $\mathbf{U}_k$ stays the same we should have $U_k(w)=U_k(\mathrm{T}^n w)$ for every $k\in\mathbb{N}$. In particular it means that $\forall k\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$\phi_k(A_{w_n})\cdot U_k(w)=U_k(w)$$

and the conditions of Corollary 1 are satisfied for $A=A_{w_n}$. As k tends to infinity one can choose an arbitrary large m satisfying (7). If $\mathbf{x}_p$ does not coincide with any of the eigenvectors

of A^T then we have $\delta > 0$, so Corollary 1 can be applied to get $\mathbf{x} \notin \mathbf{LMad}$. This shows the first statement of the proposition.

For the second statement we consider an infinite sequence $n_1 < n_2 < \ldots < n_t < \ldots$ of positive integers such that $\phi_{k_0}(A_{w_{n_t}}) = \mathrm{Id}$. By slightly modifying the arguments of Proposition 3 one can show that such a sequence also exists. We showed that if $(w, \mathbf{x}_p) \in \mathbf{LMad}$ then $\mathbf{x}_p$ must coincide with one of the eigenvalues of all matrices $A_{w_{n_t}}$, in other words all of them must share the same eigenvalue. By Lemma 7 it means that there exists a finite word $\tilde{w}$ such that $w_{n_t} = \tilde{w}^{m_t}$ which straightforwardly implies that w is periodic. □

We will associate each word $w \in \mathbb{A}_N^{\mathbb{N}}$ with another word $u = u(k) \in \mathbf{U}_k^{\mathbb{N}}$ by the following rule: $u = b_1 b_2 \ldots$ where

$$b_n = U_k(\mathrm{T}^{n-1} w).$$

Lemma 8. *Let $\mathbf{x} = (w, \mathbf{x}_p) \in \mathbf{LMad}$. Then there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $k > k_0$ and every two-letter factor $c_1 c_2$ of $u(k)$ there is the unique value $a \in \mathbb{A}_N$ with the following property:*

- *if $b_n b_{n+1} = c_1 c_2$ then $a_n = a$ where a_n is the nth letter of w.*

In other words Lemma 8 states that for k large enough any two-letter factor of u uniquely determines a one-letter factor of w.

Proof. Assume the contrary: one can find an arbitrarily large $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that there exist positive integer n and l such that $b_n b_{n+1} = b_l b_{l+1} = c_1 c_2$ but the corresponding letters $a_n = a$ and $a_l = a'$ are different. From Proposition 3 we have

$$c_1 = \phi_k(A_a) \cdot c_2; \quad \text{and} \quad c_1 = \phi_k(A_{a'}) \cdot c_2.$$

which immediately implies that

$$c_1 = \phi_k(A_{a'}^{-1} A_a) \cdot c_1 = \phi_k(D_{a-a'}) c_1.$$

In other words it means that $U_k(\mathrm{T}^n w)$ contains matrices

$$\phi_k(D_{a'-a}), \phi_k(D_{a'-a}^2), \ldots, \phi_k(D_{a'-a}^m), \ldots$$

Lemma 3 shows that this property implies that

$$\{\mathbf{x}_{p,n}, D_{a-a'}^T \mathbf{x}_{p,n}, \ \ldots \ , (D_{a-a'}^T)^m \mathbf{x}_{p,n}\} \subset B_k(\mathrm{T}^n \mathbf{x})$$

where m can be made arbitrarily large. In other words (8) is satisfied for $\mathrm{T}^n \mathbf{x}$. Take $m = p^{k+1}\delta$. Then all the conditions of Theorem 6 are satisfied for the point $\mathrm{T}^n \mathbf{x}$. If $\mathbf{x}_{p,n}$ is such that $\delta = 0$ then Theorem 6 states that $\mathrm{T}^n \mathbf{x} \notin \mathbf{LMad}$ which by the invariance of **LMad** implies that $\mathbf{x} \notin \mathbf{LMad}$. This contradicts the conditions of the lemma. Otherwise it implies that $\mathrm{T}^n \mathbf{x} \notin \mathbf{LMad}_\epsilon$ where ϵ can be made an arbitrarily small positive number as k grows to infinity. Again this leads to a contradiction. □

In particular Lemma 8 shows that if $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{LMad}$ and the word u is periodic then the word w must be periodic too. Theorem 1 gives a complete description of elements $(w, \mathbf{x}_p) \in \mathbf{LMad}$ in this case.

Now we will check that for l large enough l-letter factor of w uniquely determines $(l+1)$-letter factor of u.

Lemma 9. *Let w be uniformly recurrent word. There exists $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every l-letter factor v of w there exists unique $l+1$-letter factor v' of u such that*

- *if $v = (\mathrm{T}^n w)_l$ then $v' = (\mathrm{T}^n u)_{l+1}$.*

Proof. From the proof of Proposition 4 we know that there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every infinite word w^* starting with w_m we have $U_k(w) \subset U_k(w^*)$. Since w is uniformly recurrent there exists an absolute constant m_1 such that the distance between two consecutive factors w_m in w is at most m_1. Then one can easily check that every factor of w of length $l = m + m_1$ contains w_m as a factor. We will show that this value l works for the lemma.

Consider an arbitrary factor v of w of length l. We showed that it can be written as $v = u_1 w_m u_2$. Denote the length of u_1 by n_1. Consider an arbitrary $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(\mathrm{T}^n w)_l = v$. Then $(\mathrm{T}^{n+n_1} w)_m = w_m$ and $U_k(\mathrm{T}^{n+n_1} w) \supset U_k(w)$. However every set in the collection $\mathbf{U}_k$ has the same cardinality therefore $U_k(\mathrm{T}^{n+n_1} w) = U_k(w)$. Finally by Proposition 3, $U_k(\mathrm{T}^n w) = \phi_k(A_{v_1}) \cdot U_k(w)$. The right hand side of the last equality does not depend on the position n of the factor v so the lemma is proved. □

Proof of Theorem 2. Firstly without loss of generality we can assume that w is uniformly recurrent. Otherwise $\overline{\{\mathrm{T}^n \mathbf{x}\}}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is not minimal set invariant under T. Then we can consider its minimal subset which will be of the form $\overline{\{\mathrm{T}^n(w', \mathbf{x}'_p)\}}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ where w' is uniformly recurrent. Since $P(w', n) \leqslant P(w, n)$ all the conditions of Theorem 2 will be satisfied for w' as well and the statement of the theorem for w will easily be followed from the same statement for w'.

Suppose that a value $\mathbf{x}_p \in \mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ such that $(w, \mathbf{x}_p) \in \mathbf{LMad}$ exists. If for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that $P(w, n+1) = P(w, n)$ then w is periodic (see [5] for details). But this contradicts to the conditions of the theorem. So we should have $P(w, n+1) - P(w, n) \geqslant 1$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Also Proposition 5 shows that the sequence $\{\#\mathbf{U}_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is unbounded.

Since $P(w, n) \leqslant n + C$, there exists a value $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $n \geqslant n_0$, $P(w, n+1) - P(w, n) = 1$. Choose k_0 such that $\#\mathbf{U}_{k_0} > P(w, n_0)$. This will ensure that for each $k > k_0$, $P(w, n_0) < P(u(k), n_0 + 1)$. If for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $P(u, n) = P(u, n+1)$ then u is periodic which by Lemma 8 implies that w is periodic too — a contradiction. Hence we have $P(w, n+1) - P(u, n) \geqslant 1$ and this immediately implies that $\forall n \geqslant n_0$, $P(w, n) < P(u, n+1)$. On the other hand Lemmata 8 and 9 together imply that there exists $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\forall l \geqslant l_0$, $P(u, l) = p(w, l-1)$. So we get a contradiction with assumption that the value $\mathbf{x}_p$ exists.

Remark. The complexity condition in Theorem 2 does not seem to be sharp. One can possibly use more delicate arguments to improve them.

9 Proof of Theorem 4

Since w is uniformly recurrent, Lemma 9 can be applied to find the value $l = l(k) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every factor v of w of length l uniquely determines an element $u \in \mathbf{U}_k$. In other words as soon as $\mathrm{T}^n w$ starts with v the set $U_k(\mathrm{T}^n w)$ remains the same. Moreover the proof of Lemma 9 tells that $U_k(\mathrm{T}^n w) = U_k(v)$.

Now consider the graph G_l and take two vertices $t_1, t_2 \in T_l$ such that they are connected with the same vertex $s \in S_l$. then $U_k(s) = U_k(st_1) = U_k(st_2)$. We apply Proposition 3 to get

$$U_k(s) = \phi_k(A_s) U_k(t_1) = \phi_k(A_s) U_k(t_2) \quad \text{or} \quad U_k(t_1) = U_k(t_2).$$

By repeating this argument for every triple t_1, t_2, s in the graph G_l one can show that for any two words $t_1^*, t_2^* \in T_l$ from the same connected component of G_l we must have $U_k(t_1^*) = U_k(t_2^*)$. The number of different elements $U_k(s)$ where s runs through all vertices in S_l coincides with $\#\mathbf{U}_k$. Therefore if the number of connected components in G_l is bounded by absolute constant independent on l then $\#\mathbf{U}_k$ is bounded by the same constant. However Proposition 5 states that in this case $(w, \mathbf{x}_p) \notin \mathbf{LMad}$ for every $\mathbf{x}_p \in \mathbf{P}^1_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$.

It would be interesting to investigate the graphs G_l for various infinite words w. They are surely connected for infinite words w such that $\{\mathrm{T}^n w\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is dense everywhere on $\mathbb{A}_N^{\mathbb{N}}$. On the other hand numerical evidence suggests that the number of connected components of G_l for Thue-Morse word w_{tm} tends to infinity as $l \to \infty$. Even though the author does not know the proof of this fact it seems that Thue-Morse word is not covered by the last theorem.

References

[1] D. Badziahin, Y. Bugeaud, M. Einsiedler, D. Kleinbock, On the complexity of a putative counterexample to the p-adic Littlewood conjecture. Preprint, 2014.

[2] Y. Bugeaud, M. Drmota, and B. de Mathan, On a mixed Littlewood conjecture in Diophantine approximation. *Acta Arith.* V. 128 pp. 107–124, 2007.

[3] J. W. S. Cassels, An introduction to Diophantine Approximation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1955.

[4] M. Einsiedler and D. Kleinbock, Measure rigidity and p-adic Littlewood-type problems. *Compositio Math.* V. 143 pp. 689–702, 2007.

[5] M. Lothaire, Algebraic combinatorics on words. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

[6] B. de Mathan et O. Teulié, Problèmes diophantiens simultanés. *Monatsh. Math.* V. 143 pp. 229–245, 2004.

Dzmitry A. Badziahin: Department of Mathematics, Durham University,
Durham, DH1 3LE, England.
e-mail: dzmitry.badziahin@durham.ac.uk